UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

√-0

JS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/185,878	11/03/98	LENT J	NEXTP002

LM02/0912

RITTER VAN PELT AND YI
4906 EL CAMINO REAL
SUITE 205
LOS ALTOS CA 94022

EXAMINER
HAYES, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2761	11

DATE MAILED: 09/12/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

RA

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/185,878	Applicant(s) LENT ET AL.	
	Examiner John W Hayes	Art Unit 2761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 February 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 November 1998* is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:

1.☐ received.

2.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____ .

3.☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
18)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Applicant is advised that the Notice of Allowance mailed is vacated. If the issue fee has already been paid, applicant may request a refund or request that the fee be credited to a deposit account. However, applicant may wait until the application is either found allowable or held abandoned. If allowed, upon receipt of a new Notice of Allowance, applicant may request that the previously submitted issue fee be applied. If abandoned, applicant may request refund or credit to a Deposit Account.

2. The indicated allowability of claims 1-11 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to *Titan*, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,654. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 3 November 1998 are subject to correction of the informalities indicated on the "Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948 attached to paper number 5. In order to avoid abandonment of this application, correction is required.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 4A does not indicate reference character "400" in accordance with the specification, page 15, second line from the bottom of the page. Correction is required.

5. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per claim 10, the preamble recites "a computer program embodied on a carrier wave", however, does not recite that the computer program is encoded or recorded on a physical medium readable by a computer. Thus, the claim is directed to functionally descriptive material that is not functionally or structurally interrelated to the medium. Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer readable media (defined as "a collective word for the physical material, such as paper, disk, and tape, used for storing computer-based information", Microsoft Press, Computer Dictionary, Second Edition, © 1994) are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are neither physical "things" nor statutory processes. Such claimed data structures do no define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker et al*, PCT Application WO 97/22073, published 19 June 1997 in view of *Titan*, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,654 and *Norris*, U.S. Patent No. 5,940,811.

As per claim 1, *Walker et al* discloses a method of presenting a reason for the rejection of a credit application from an applicant comprising obtaining a scoring factor from a credit bureau for the application (Page 3, lines 4-10 and Page 9, lines 19-25), mapping the factor identified by the credit bureau

information to an internal rejection code (Page 10 line 25 – Page 11 line 4; Page 12; and Page 13, lines 4-13), and providing a rejection of the credit application based on an internal rejection code (Grades B-D) corresponding generally to a reason for the rejection (credit score, debt burden, high liability, etc.) to the user of the system (Page 12 line 1-Page 13 line 3; Page 13, lines 9-13; Page 20, lines 5-10; Page 21, lines 1-6; Page 22, lines 5-10; Page 26, lines 7-13 and Figures 9-10h). Although *Walker et al* discusses credit score, debt burden and high liability as reasons for rejection, *Walker et al*, however, fails to disclose the specific reason for the different levels of rejection corresponding to the rejection codes (B-D). *Titan* discloses a system and method that provides rapid explanations for the scores determined by a neural network and teaches that the system can be used to provide an explanation of the input variables that most significantly caused the resulting score leading to a denial of credit (Col. 1, lines 40-51). *Titan* also discloses the use of internal rejection codes corresponding to explanations for the rejection of a credit transaction or credit application (Col. 7 line 63-Col. 8 line 5 and Col. 8 line 63-Col. 9 line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *Walker et al* and include the specific reasons for rejection as taught by *Titan* so that the user of the system can immediately understand the actual reason that the application was denied and further take steps to correct the problem to prevent future applications for credit from being denied.

Walker et al further discloses that the rejection information is provided to the user of the system which in this case is a local branch representative, however, *Walker et al* does not specifically teach that the user is the actual applicant for credit. *Norris* discloses a method and apparatus for automatic processing of typical financial transactions including loan applications and credit card and debit card applications. *Norris* also teaches that when an applicant applies for credit, the applicant's credit report is obtained from a credit bureau, evaluated using an underwriter model and a decision is made based on the evaluation whether to grant or deny the loan or credit card application and the system then informs the borrower of the decision (Col. 6, lines 45-55 and Col. 7, lines 28-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *Walker et al* and incorporate the capability to communicate the results of the credit application evaluation directly to the applicant rather than using a mediator such as a bank branch representative to relay the information.

Norris provides motivation by indicating that communicating directly with the applicant provides more convenience to applicants since they could apply for credit using kiosks or other computer means placed in a convenient locations (Col. 1, lines 20-57; Col. 2, lines 27-34 and Col. 4, lines 15-20).

As per claims 2 and 3, *Walker et al* further discloses determining whether the internal rejection code corresponds to a specific code or a general code and performing various tests to determine whether the result corresponds to an appropriate rejection reason, and if so, assigning the appropriate internal rejection code for the specific rejection reason or assigning a general rejection code (Page 12 line 1-Page 13 line 3; Page 13, lines 9-13; Page 20, lines 5-10; Page 21, lines 1-6; Page 22, lines 5-10; Page 25 line 20-Page 26 line 13 and Figures 9-10h).

As per claims 4 and 5, *Walker et al* discloses that a local branch representative typically informs the applicant if the application for credit is rejected for any reason, however, does not specifically disclose that the system requests and receives an acknowledgment from the applicant that he/she actually received the rejection information. *Norris* discloses that the method of loan application processing includes execution, without human intervention, of regulatory requirements related to consumer financing and that regulatory approvals can be obtained by first displaying documents on the monitor screen, highlighting those requiring careful explanation and obtaining both the consumer's acknowledgement that they were explained and that he/she understood them (Col. 2, lines 48-53; Col. 5, lines 22-39; Col. 6, lines 57-64; and Col. 10, lines 28-34).

As per claim 9, *Walker et al* discloses a system for presenting a reason for the rejection of a credit application from an applicant comprising obtaining a scoring factor from a credit bureau for the application (Page 3, lines 4-10 and Page 9, lines 19-25), mapping the factor identified by the credit bureau information to an internal rejection code (Page 10 line 25 – Page 11 line 4; Page 12; and Page 13, lines 4-13), and providing a rejection of the credit application based on an internal rejection code (Grades B-D) corresponding generally to a reason for the rejection (credit score, debt burden, high liability, etc.) to

the user of the system (Page 12 line 1-Page 13 line 3; Page 13, lines 9-13; Page 20, lines 5-10; Page 21, lines 1-6; Page 22, lines 5-10; Page 26, lines 7-13 and Figures 9-10h). Although *Walker et al* discusses credit score, debt burden and high liability as reasons for rejection, *Walker et al*, however, fails to disclose the specific reason for the different levels of rejection corresponding to the rejection codes (B-D). *Titan* discloses a system and method that provides rapid explanations for the scores determined by a neural network and teaches that the system can be used to provide an explanation of the input variables that most significantly caused the resulting score leading to a denial of credit (Col. 1, lines 40-51). *Titan* also discloses the use of internal rejection codes corresponding to explanations for the rejection of a credit transaction or credit application (Col. 7 line 63-Col. 8 line 5 and Col. 8 line 63-Col. 9 line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *Walker et al* and include the specific reasons for rejection as taught by *Titan* so that the user of the system can immediately understand the actual reason that the application was denied and further take steps to correct the problem to prevent future applications for credit from being denied.

Walker et al further discloses that the rejection information is provided to the user of the system which in this case is a local branch representative, however, *Walker et al* does not specifically teach that the user is the actual applicant for credit. *Walker et al* also does not specifically disclose that the system further includes and Underwriter operative to perform these functions. *Norris* discloses a method and apparatus for automatic processing of typical financial transactions including loan applications and credit card and debit card applications. *Norris* also teaches that when an applicant applies for credit, an underwriter model is utilized to obtain the applicant's credit report from a credit bureau, evaluate the information and a make a decision based on the evaluation whether to grant or deny the loan or credit card application and the system then inform the borrower of the decision (Col. 6, lines 45-55 and Col. 7, lines 28-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer program of *Walker et al* and incorporate an underwriter capability to evaluate the application and communicate the results of the credit application evaluation directly to the applicant rather than using a mediator such as a bank branch representative to relay the information. *Norris* provides motivation by indicating that communicating directly with the applicant provides more

convenience to applicants since they could apply for credit using kiosks or other computer means placed in a convenient locations (Col. 1, lines 20-57; Col. 2, lines 27-34 and Col. 4, lines 15-20).

As per claim 10, *Walker et al* discloses a computer program which is carried out and operates the system for presenting a reason for the rejection of a credit application from an applicant comprising program code operative to obtain a scoring factor from a credit bureau for the application (Page 3, lines 4-10 and Page 9, lines 19-25), program code operative to map the factor identified by the credit bureau information to an internal rejection code (Page 10 line 25 – Page 11 line 4; Page 12; and Page 13, lines 4-13), and program code operative to provide a rejection of the credit application based on an internal rejection code (Grades B-D) corresponding generally to a reason for the rejection (credit score, debt burden, high liability, etc.) to the user of the system (Page 12 line 1-Page 13 line 3; Page 13, lines 9-13; Page 20, lines 5-10; Page 21, lines 1-6; Page 22, lines 5-10; Page 26, lines 7-13 and Figures 9-10h). Although *Walker et al* discusses credit score, debt burden and high liability as reasons for rejection, *Walker et al*, however, fails to disclose the specific reason for the different levels of rejection corresponding to the rejection codes (B-D). *Titan* discloses a system and method that provides rapid explanations for the scores determined by a neural network and teaches that the system can be used to provide an explanation of the input variables that most significantly caused the resulting score leading to a denial of credit (Col. 1, lines 40-51). *Titan* also discloses the use of internal rejection codes corresponding to explanations for the rejection of a credit transaction or credit application (Col. 7 line 63-Col. 8 line 5 and Col. 8 line 63-Col. 9 line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *Walker et al* and include the specific reasons for rejection as taught by *Titan* so that the user of the system can immediately understand the actual reason that the application was denied and further take steps to correct the problem to prevent future applications for credit from being denied.

Walker et al further discloses that the rejection information is provided to the user of the system which in this case is a local branch representative, however, *Walker et al* does not specifically teach that the user is the actual applicant for credit. *Walker et al* also does not specifically disclose that the system

further includes and Underwriter operative to perform these functions. *Norris* discloses a computer program for automatic processing of typical financial transactions including loan applications and credit card and debit card applications. *Norris* also teaches that when an applicant applies for credit, an underwriter model is utilized to obtain the applicant's credit report from a credit bureau, evaluate the information and a make a decision based on the evaluation whether to grant or deny the loan or credit card application and the system then inform the borrower of the decision (Col. 6, lines 45-55 and Col. 7, lines 28-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer program of *Walker et al* and incorporate an underwriter capability to evaluate the application and communicate the results of the credit application evaluation directly to the applicant rather than using a mediator such as a bank branch representative to relay the information. *Norris* provides motivation by indicating that communicating directly with the applicant provides more convenience to applicants since they could apply for credit using kiosks or other computer means placed in a convenient locations (Col. 1, lines 20-57; Col. 2, lines 27-34 and Col. 4, lines 15-20).

As per claim 11, *Walker et al* discloses a computer readable medium having program code embodied therein for presenting a reason for the rejection of a credit application from an applicant comprising program code operative to obtain a scoring factor from a credit bureau for the application (Page 3, lines 4-10 and Page 9, lines 19-25), program code operative to map the factor identified by the credit bureau information to an internal rejection code (Page 10 line 25 – Page 11 line 4; Page 12; and Page 13, lines 4-13), and program code operative to provide a rejection of the credit application based on an internal rejection code (Grades B-D) corresponding generally to a reason for the rejection (credit score, debt burden, high liability, etc.) to the user of the system (Page 12 line 1-Page 13 line 3; Page 13, lines 9-13; Page 20, lines 5-10; Page 21, lines 1-6; Page 22, lines 5-10; Page 26, lines 7-13 and Figures 9-10h). Although *Walker et al* discusses credit score, debt burden and high liability as reasons for rejection, *Walker et al*, however, fails to disclose the specific reason for the different levels of rejection corresponding to the rejection codes (B-D). *Titan* discloses a system and method that provides rapid explanations for the scores determined by a neural network and teaches that the system can be used to

provide an explanation of the input variables that most significantly caused the resulting score leading to a denial of credit (Col. 1, lines 40-51). *Titan* also discloses the use of internal rejection codes corresponding to explanations for the rejection of a credit transaction or credit application (Col. 7 line 63-Col. 8 line 5 and Col. 8 line 63-Col. 9 line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of *Walker et al* and include the specific reasons for rejection as taught by *Titan* so that the user of the system can immediately understand the actual reason that the application was denied and further take steps to correct the problem to prevent future applications for credit from being denied.

Walker et al further discloses that the rejection information is provided to the user of the system which in this case is a local branch representative, however, *Walker et al* does not specifically teach that the user is the actual applicant for credit. *Walker et al* also does not specifically disclose that the system further includes and Underwriter operative to perform these functions. *Norris* discloses a computer readable medium having program code embodied therein for automatic processing of typical financial transactions including loan applications and credit card and debit card applications. *Norris* also teaches that when an applicant applies for credit, an underwriter model is utilized to obtain the applicant's credit report from a credit bureau, evaluate the information and a make a decision based on the evaluation whether to grant or deny the loan or credit card application and the system then inform the borrower of the decision (Col. 6, lines 45-55 and Col. 7, lines 28-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer program of *Walker et al* and incorporate an underwriter capability to evaluate the application and communicate the results of the credit application evaluation directly to the applicant rather than using a mediator such as a bank branch representative to relay the information. *Norris* provides motivation by indicating that communicating directly with the applicant provides more convenience to applicants since they could apply for credit using kiosks or other computer means placed in a convenient locations (Col. 1, lines 20-57; Col. 2, lines 27-34 and Col. 4, lines 15-20).

10. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker et al*, PCT Application WO 97/22073, published 19 June 1997, *Titan*, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,654 and *Norris*, U.S. Patent No. 5,940,811 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Zandi*, U.S. Patent No. 5,966,699.

As per claim 6, *Walker et al* and *Titan* disclose an "on-line system" and method for providing a rejection reason to an applicant and *Norris* discloses a remote kiosk based system that communicates with a transaction processor via communication lines, however, neither *Walker et al, Titan* nor *Norris* specifically disclose that the method is carried out by providing a web page to the applicant that includes the rejection reason. *Zandi* discloses a system and method for conducting a loan auction over a computer network and teaches a method of allowing a borrower to complete an application for a loan over the Internet via a web page (Col. 2, lines 15-40 and Figures 1-2) and notifying the applicant whether the loan is approved or denied including the reasons for denial (Col. 8, lines 17-28 and 45-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of *Walker et al, Titan* and *Norris* and incorporate the capability to communicate with the applicant via web pages over the Internet taught by *Zandi* for the benefit of allowing applicants to apply for credit from any location that has access to the Internet. This would obviously provide more convenience to the applicant as well as increase the number of potential customers for the lending institution.

With respect to claims 7 and 8, as described above in accordance with claim 6, neither *Walker et al, Titan* nor *Norris* disclose providing a web page to the applicant that includes the rejection reason and further providing an acknowledgment button to the applicant as part of the web page or providing an applet that communicates that the web page has been downloaded. *Norris*, however, discloses that the method of loan application processing includes execution, without human intervention, of regulatory requirements related to consumer financing and that regulatory approvals can be obtained by first displaying documents on the monitor screen, highlighting those requiring careful explanation and obtaining both the consumer's acknowledgement that they were explained and that he/she understood

them (Col. 2, lines 48-53; Col. 5, lines 22-39; Col. 6, lines 57-64; and Col. 10, lines 28-34). *Zandi* discloses a system and method for conducting a loan auction over a computer network and teaches a method of allowing a borrower to complete an application for a loan over the Internet via a web page (Col. 2, lines 15-40 and Figures 1-2) and notifying the applicant whether the loan is approved or denied including the reasons for denial (Col. 8, lines 17-28 and 45-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of *Walker et al, Titan* and *Norris* and implement the Internet and web page features taught by *Zandi* and include an acknowledgement button on the web page so that the applicant can acknowledge that the rejection information was received or automatically communicating to the lender that the web page with the rejection information was downloaded by the applicant without requiring affirmative acknowledgement by the applicant in order for the lender to meet the regulatory requirements for lending practices in view of the teachings of *Norris*.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Dykstra et al [5,611,052] discloses an apparatus and method for automatic credit evaluation and loan processing and teaches accessing a credit bureau for credit information pertaining to the applicant and applies a credit scoring model to determine the approval/rejection of the application.
- Jones et al discloses a method for the real-time automatic determination of the approval status of a potential borrower of a loan and teaches obtaining a credit worthiness score from a credit bureau and comparing this score to a table of score ranges obtained from the lender to determine the approval/rejection status of the applicant
- Tengel et al discloses deriving a proprietary credit score, typically a "FICO score", from a credit bureau to determine the credit score of a borrower.
- Canter, Ronal S. discloses that The Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) mandates that a prompt, meaningful disclosure of all reasons that a consumer credit application has been denied is provided to the consumer.

- "Low Rent Loan Officer In a Kiosk" by Bank Technology News discloses an automated loan machine that uses a bank's underwriting criteria and credit bureau data to accept or reject a loan application, and if the loan is rejected the system provides an explanation of the reasons for rejection.
- Calvey, Mark, "Internet Gives Bankers a Snappy Comeback" discloses a system launched by NextCard that provides an immediate response service to applicants who apply for a credit card via its web page wherein applicants can customize the card's features and process balance transfers online.
- American Banker, "Users of Credit Scoring Face Tough Rules on Notification" discloses Federal regulations concerning the requirement for lenders to provide specific reasons for the rejection of credit
- McShane, Peter K., "Got Financing" discloses that specific reasons for rejection of credit is important to the applicant in that it helps them focus their energy on what they need to do to improve their chances for approval in the future
- Borowsky, Mark, "The Neural Net: Predictor of Fraud or Victim of Hype?" discloses that HNC, Inc has a system that can give reasons for credit decisions
- Atkins discloses a system for managing financial accounts and teaches that if a mortgage application is rejected either by the loan department or the legal and regulatory compliance department, the approval is denied and a report is issued to the involved parties stating the reason for its denial.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Hayes whose telephone number is (703)306-5447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 5:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Voeltz, can be reached on (703) 305-9714.

The Fax phone number for the **UNOFFICIAL FAX** for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-0040 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

The Fax phone number for the **OFFICIAL FAX** for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-9051 or 9052 (for formal communications intended for entry).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jwh

27 June 2000

EMANUEL TODD VOELTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700